

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 JOHN A.H. EDSALL, SR.,

12 Plaintiff,

2:02-cv-2155-GEB-GGH-P

13 vs.

14 R.N. JOHNSON, et al.,

15 Defendants.

ORDER

16 _____/
17 On August 29, 2005, plaintiff filed objections to the
18 magistrate judge's order filed August 10, 2005, in which
19 Plaintiff's second amended complaint was disregarded because it
20 exceeded the scope of an authorized amendment. Plaintiff's
21 August 29 objections are construed as a request for
22 reconsideration. Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 72-303(f), a
23 magistrate judge's orders shall be upheld unless "clearly
24 erroneous or contrary to law." Since the magistrate judge's
25
26

1 August 10 ruling was not clearly erroneous or contrary to law,
2 that Order is affirmed.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: September 19, 2005

5
6 /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26